DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 473 814 PS 031 066

AUTHOR	Leonard, Robin; Clements, Andrea D.
TITLE	Parental Attitudes toward Cross Gender Behavior.
PUB DATE	2002-11-08
NOTE	23p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Age Differences; *Child Behavior; Fathers; Mothers; *Parent Attitudes; Parent Child Relationship; Sex Stereotypes; Sexual Identity

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the differences in parental attitudes toward cross gender behavior in children. It was hypothesized that cross gender behavior would be seen as more acceptable for girls than boys, that this effect would be more prominent in fathers than in mothers, and that parental acceptance of cross gender behavior would decrease as a child got older. Instruments were sent to both parents of 446 elementary school children, of which 172 were returned. Responses to the measure of parental attitudes toward cross gender behavior indicated that fathers generally hold more traditional gender role values than mothers do. However, both parents hold more traditional views concerning appropriate behavior for boys. No significant relationships were found between child age and parent attitudes. Study limitations included return rate, percentage of fathers completing the surveys, and the restrictive demographic characteristics of the accessible population. (Contains 31 references.) (Author/HTH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Running Head: CROSS GENDER BEHAVIOR

ED 473 814

Parental Attitudes Toward Cross Gender Behavior

Robin Leonard

Andrea D. Clements

East Tennessee State University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PS031066

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☆ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robin Leonard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Abstract

The purpose of this research was to investigate the differences in parental attitudes toward cross gender behavior in children. This researcher attempted to answer four questions: 1. Do gender differences exist between mothers and fathers with regard to attitudes toward cross gender behavior? 2. Are attitudes different as an effect of the sex of the child? 3. Do attitudes and acceptance change as an effect of the child's age? In this study, two instruments were sent to both parents of 446 elementary school children, 172 were returned. One instrument, which measured Parental Attitudes Toward Cross Gender Behavior, and its results are described in this paper. Results indicated that fathers generally hold more traditional gender role values than mothers do ($F = 12.453$, $p < .000$), however, both parents hold more traditional views concerning appropriate behavior for boys ($t = -10.155$, $p < .000$). No significant relationships were found between child age and parent attitudes. Limitations included return rate, percentage of fathers completing surveys, and the restrictive demographic characteristics of the accessible population.

Parental Attitudes Toward Cross Gender Behavior

As we enter the twenty-first century, many would be inclined to believe that we are becoming a more enlightened culture, caring for and protecting all human rights because we realize the value of individuality. However, research shows that stereotyping, and discrimination based upon this stereotyping, is still very widespread (Antill, 1987; Burn, O'Neil, & Nederend, 1996; Feinman, 1981, Sandnabba & Ahlberg, 1999). While many people give lip service to the fact that all are equal, repeated studies have shown that a large portion of the population still has very traditional values concerning what constitutes appropriate and inappropriate behavior and attitudes for women and men (Burn et al., 1996; Campagnola, 1995; Feinman, 1981). Children seem to acquire their parents' values for men and women, and generalize these beliefs into their own lives, demonstrating gender-typed behaviors at a very young age. A vast amount of research exists which attempts to explain gender stereotyping and a child's socialization to their respective gender role (Antill, 1987; Burge, 1981; Fagot & Leinbach, 1995). However, little research exists which explains gender role acquisition from a physiological perspective, perhaps because psychologists tend to believe that these differences are readily evident. The nontraditional child is also becoming widely researched, with various studies examining the effects of societal stereotypes on the cross gender child, a child who exhibits the behaviors, tastes, and play choices considered by society as appropriate for the opposite gender, and the peer alienation that the child ultimately faces as a result of these stereotypes (Antill, 1987; Burn et al., 1996; Martin, 1995; Sandnabba & Ahlberg, 1999). Another current theme examines health and psychological problems as they relate to strictly enforced traditional gender roles, and the health and psychological benefits that can result from having an egalitarian philosophy. A brief overview of current literature about the nontraditional child, defined for this research as a child who exhibits cross gender behavior, and gender stereotyping demonstrates that there are many questions still left unanswered. One such question relates to the extent to which parental attitudes toward cross-gender behavior change as a child grows older, which was the main focus of this study. Differences between mothers' and fathers' responses regarding cross gender behavior,

and how these parental responses correspond to the gender of the child were also examined.

Differences between men and women have been a topic for debate since ancient times. Aristotle himself made mention of a few key differences between men and women, stating that men are more courageous and women, more slanderous (Dworetzky, 1997). Many theories exist which attempt to explain gender differences and how they are acquired.

Surprisingly, the theory without much research support is a purely biological model, which hypothesizes that all differences between men and women are genetically imprinted at birth and are not affected by socialization into a specific culture. Aristotle was the first philosopher to propose that differences in men and women were the result of purely biological factors (Dworetzky, 1997). Since then, some scientists and psychologists have attempted to account for gender differences from a hormonal or neurological perspective. Most of the evidence presented for this theory has centered on the different spatial and mathematical abilities of boys and girls, such as Geschwind and Behan's theory that suggested hormonal differences determined a boys' superior math ability (1982). However, contradictory evidence has suggested that some of these traits are not linked to the genetic characteristic of being male, but rather, masculinity, a personality characteristic derived from associating with things that are considered manly (Dworetzky, 1997). Of course, we cannot deny the inherent biological differences between men and women beginning with the difference at the chromosomal level. The difference in the twenty-third chromosome pair undoubtedly plays a major role in all gender differences, even those not physically evident. Some of those differences have been related to the survival of some societies; however, the contribution of biological factors to our eventual gender roles is still unclear. Most agree that biological and social factors work together to form our concept of gender and appropriate behaviors for that gender (Antill, 1987).

Both cognitive and behavioral theorists have offered propositions for the method by which children acquire gender roles. Social learning theories, based upon the 1963 work of Albert Bandura, suggest that children acquire their gender behaviors by modeling behaviors of their same sexed parents and peers. Another behavior theory,

operant conditioning, offers the explanation that children learn specific behaviors based upon the positive or negative reinforcement that is given for these behaviors (as cited by Dworetzky, 1997). In 1966, Kohlberg proposed a cognitive component at work in the process of gender role acquisition. Cognitive theories suggest that children will not begin to demonstrate any gender-typed characteristics until they are old enough to have a cognitive understanding of what it means to be a girl or boy (as cited by Dworetzky, 1997). However, researchers have realized that any of these theories, within themselves, are insufficient explanations for gender role acquisition. The gender schema theory, proposed by Bem in 1981, has been the most influential integration theory, suggesting that children acquire environmental input and then organize it schematically by categorizing this information as best they can (Dworetzky, 1997; Fagot & Leinbach, 1989).

This leads us to the investigation of what types of information we provide our children to organize. Differential treatment of children by parents has been widely studied, and the results have been very enlightening (Campagnola, 1995; Fivush, Brotman, Buckner, & Goodman, 2000; Rothbart & Maccoby, 1966). Rothbart and Maccoby (1966) demonstrated that parents react to their children based upon their own gender and the gender of their children. Their results suggested that fathers are more permissive with a daughter's undesirable behavior, while mothers are more permissive with a sons'. This was one of the earlier studies suggesting that the gender of the parent is partially responsible for the differential treatment of children. Campagnola (1995) investigated sex-differentiated parent-child interactions using, as his subjects, the parents of one-year-old opposite-sex twins. In his observational study, he found that mothers and fathers inhibited their sons more than their daughters. Fathers encouraged more gender appropriate play in both girls and boys, while mothers encouraged more neutral play in their sons than they did in their daughters play. One of the most recent research ventures into the area of differential treatment deals with gender differences in parent-child emotional conversation. Parents were asked to converse with their child about four past events when the child felt emotion (e.g., remember when we saw the fireworks and you were scared?). Conversations were assessed by the number of emotional terms used by the parent and the level of interpersonal communication

between parent and child. Mother-child conversations were longer, and mothers discussed more emotion and causes of the emotion with both sons and daughters. However, both parents used fewer emotion words and more autonomous, or impersonal, themes when conversing with sons, than when they were conversing with daughters (Fivush et al., 2000). These studies support a picture of differing parent reactions to sons and daughters.

Many studies have stressed the importance of modeling as a necessary precursor to a child's development of a specific gender role, specifically the extent to which parents incorporate their own beliefs and values into their child-rearing practices (Antill, 1987; Burge, 1981; Fagot & Leinbach, 1989). In 1981, Burge investigated the correlation between parents' scores on a sex role attitude scale and a child rearing sex-role attitude scale that she developed for the study. She found a significant positive correlation between an individual's score on an adult sex-role scale and his/her score on the child rearing scale. Fagot and Leinbach (1989) looked at the relationships between parental stereotypes and young children's gender schema. A longitudinal study was performed which assessed children's ability to label gender at 18 months (before labeling ability), at 27 months (considered early labeling), and at 4 years to determine if early labelers scored higher on a sex role discrimination scale. Parental gender-role stereotypes were assessed using a variety of measures, and results showed that parents with more traditional views had a higher percentage of children who were early labelers. Early labelers were also more aware of cultural stereotypes at the age of four. Boys and girls who were early labelers spent a significantly greater amount of time playing with gender-appropriate toys than average labelers did. Fagot and Leinbach extended this study in 1995 to include more analyses of egalitarian families in which both parents encourage gender equality in all areas of their children's lives. They found that children from egalitarian families acquired gender labels later and demonstrated less gender-role knowledge at the age of four. Egalitarian fathers were more liberal, more open to women's rights and female equality, than their traditional counterparts. On average, fathers in the egalitarian setting spent more time with their children and were more positive in their parent-child interactions. Fagot and Leinbach made the observation that it is the fathers who are different in these family settings; the mothers are very much the

same across both types of households. Antill (1987) compared several variables linked to child-rearing practices, such as parents' belief systems, traditional vs. egalitarian gender-role values, and background and personality. He found that the strongest predictor of child-rearing practices was traditional vs. egalitarian values, where traditional values emphasized the importance of separate roles and rules for each gender, and egalitarian values emphasized the importance of gender equality in all areas.

It has become increasingly evident during recent years that members of society hold differing values concerning what is appropriate for boys and girls (Antill, 1987; Burn et al., 1996; Feinman, 1981; Sandnabba & Ahlberg, 1999). A great deal of research has been dedicated to determining how we, as a society, treat and evaluate children who do not conform to our societal norms. Feinman (1981) surveyed 169 college students using the Measure of Disapproval of Cross-Sex Behavior and the Measure of Disapproval of Appropriate-Sex Behavior and found that cross-gender behavior in a boy was much more widely disapproved of than cross-gender behavior in a girl, confirming the common belief that it is better to be a tomboy than a sissy. Being a tomboy has been related to a wide variety of positive attributes, including assertiveness, self-reliance, situational flexibility, and feelings of well-being. Investigation into tomboyism demonstrated that it is a very common occurrence in young girls. In a study of 194 college-age females, 50% replied that they had been tomboys as girls (Burn, O'Neil, & Nederend, 1996). Reasons given for discontinuing their boyish ways included biological changes as well as increased social pressures to start acting like a girl during adolescence (Burn et al., 1996). Martin (1995) looked at stereotypes regarding traditional and non-traditional children. She asked 154 undergraduates to estimate the occurrence of particular traits among four groups, traditional girls, tomboys, traditional boys, and sissies. She found that people perceived tomboys to have very similar characteristics to boys, but that girls shared almost no characteristics with sissies. In fact, sissies were perceived to have very few of the desirable characteristics for either gender. The sissy stereotype possessed very few features, positive or negative. In another study evaluating parental attitudes of gender-role behaviors, Antill (1987) found that fathers believe that cross-gender children, defined by laypeople as tomboys and

sissies, have a greater chance of becoming homosexual, especially fathers who were reporting on sons. This effect is much weaker in mothers. This finding was verified by the work of Sandnabba and Ahlberg in 1999. They investigated more than 200 parents of five-year old children, who filled out questionnaires designed to assess their stereotypes regarding cross-gender behavior. Results revealed that parents' perceptions of cross-gender children were that they would be less psychologically adjusted as adults, and that this effect would be greater for boys. As a whole, cross-gender boys were viewed more negatively than cross-gender girls, and were perceived to be at a greater risk for becoming homosexual in adulthood. Early research into this area found a strong association between cross gender behavior in childhood and adult homosexuality (Bell, Weinberg, & Hammersmith, 1981). Frequently, research into this area presumes a biological determinant that affects both childhood and adult sexual orientation (Bell et al., 1981). This viewpoint has been criticized in recent years, however. One major argument postulates that it is impossible to find a simple biological trait that is universally responsible for a construct, such as cross-gender behavior, that is culturally determined (Paul, 1993). Another study found that the only significantly heritable trait was gender nonconformity in childhood, and that this trait was not an indicator of future homosexuality (Bailey, Dunne, & Martin, 2000).

Society tends to hold boys to a more rigid set of rules. Dr. William Pollack (1999) of Harvard University refers to these rules as the boy code. He stated that society imposes a "gender straitjacket" on boys, not allowing them to express their emotions and not teaching them how to deal with them. For generations we have enforced the idea that boys should be tough, stoic, independent, and inexpressive people. Because this is an impossible ideal for a child, or even an adult, to live up to, boys experience frustration, depression, and anger. Pollack suggests that the boy code, along with increased media violence, access to weapons, and absence of parents, is responsible for the recent outbreaks of school violence among adolescent boys (Pollack, 1999). If this is true, it suggests a reason to encourage more egalitarian child rearing, particularly with boys.

Gender differences in the emotional experiences of children and adolescents have been well researched (Garner, Robertson, & Smith, 1997; Stapley & Haviland, 1989; Zeman & Shipman, 1996). Research has indicated that girls display more positive

emotions than boys (Garner et al., 1997), and that girls allow themselves to feel a broader spectrum of emotions including sadness, shame, and self-hostility (Stapley et al., 1989). Girls also tend to find emotional security through peer and familial affiliations (Stapley et al., 1989), and report using verbal methods to communicate emotions (Zeman & Shipman, 1996). Boys, on the other hand, display more negative emotions such as anger reactions (Garner et al., 1997), and boys report more frequent occurrences of contempt emotions (Stapley et al., 1989). Boys find emotional security through activities and achievements (Stapley et al., 1989), and report using mild aggressive methods to communicate emotions (Zeman & Shipman, 1996). The search for the causes of these differences tends to point a finger toward the influence of a child's parents in their socialization to emotion (Fivush et al., 2000; Garner et al., 1997), although some may be more genetically/physiologically influenced. Mothers and fathers report knowingly using different emotion socialization practices with their children, often depending upon the child's gender (Garner et al., 1997). Anger is more tolerated in boys, while girls are expected to have more emotional control (Garner et al., 1997). In addition, both mothers and fathers have been found to discuss emotion, especially sadness, with girls significantly more than they do with boys (Fivush et al., 2000). Of course, boys are not without emotion, and a large number of adolescent boys report suppressing emotions due to societal pressures in adolescence (Glazer, 1999). This emotional suppression may lead to increased hostile thoughts and anger reactions (Glazer, 1999; Ko, 1999). After interviews with several high school boys, Ko concluded that fighting and violence are a way for boys to prove that they meet society's standards of masculinity. At the same time, this violence allows the release of emotions that are otherwise not allowed to be expressed. This research tends to support Pollack's ideas of an "emotional straitjacket" relating to school violence in adolescent boys.

Traditional roles may not only be harmful to boys (Glazer, 1999; Ko, 1999; Zeman & Shipman, 1996), but studies indicate that they may have adverse effects on girls. College females from the United States, Japan, and Slovenia were surveyed to reveal their levels of traditional gender roles, or the degree to which they believed that men and women have different roles in society, and the extent to which they felt bound by these roles. It was found that women with more egalitarian gender values, considering

themselves as complete equals with men, tended to be more career-oriented than women with traditional values. While not necessarily a harmful thing to be less career oriented, the potential that is unexpressed in women who would prefer to be more career-oriented should be recognized (Morinaga, Frieze, & Ferligoj, 1993).

Silverstein and Blumenthal (1997) discovered a very adverse effect of strict gender-role expectations in females. In a study of 100 female high school students and their mothers, they found that females whose mothers reported a feeling of having been trapped by traditional gender roles were significantly more likely to report symptoms of anxious somatic depression. Of the respondents whose mothers received a low score on the scale, only two percent reported symptoms of anxious somatic depression, compared with 28% of the respondents whose mothers had scored high. This finding indicates that feeling trapped in a gender role is related to depression, somatic problems, and eating disorders in daughters.

Where traditional values have been associated with emotional problems in children and adults, egalitarian values have been linked to a number of healthy outcomes. Androgynous individuals, or individuals who possess both masculine and feminine characteristics, have been found to possess greater self-esteem and adaptability (Burn et al., 1966; Witt, 1997). Females with non-traditional values, who believe in male/female equality, exhibit greater motivation and desire to succeed (Morinaga et al., 1993). Parents who possess egalitarian values have been shown to be more positive in exchanges with their children (Fagot & Leinbach, 1995), and a recent study by Garren (1998) also related that positive characteristics of egalitarian parenting, such as tolerance and permissiveness toward freethinking, encouraging creativity in children.

Several themes permeate the results of previous research conducted in this area. Many studies suggest that men and fathers are more traditional in their views on appropriate male/female behavior than mothers and women (Campagnola,1995; Fagot & Leinbach, 1995; Fivush et al., 2000). Research also is convincing that stricter roles are imposed upon boys as opposed to girls, and that boys who engage in cross gender behaviors are more negatively viewed than girls who exhibit tomboy behaviors. The parent's role in a child's socialization process has been well documented (Antill, 1987; Burge, 1981; Fagot & Leinbach, 1989), including the differential ways that parents treat

their children and the relationship between these treatments and the child's development and freedom of choice. The final themes that emerge in this research address the problems that children and adolescents encounter as a result of strict traditional gender role orientation, including depression, anxiety, and possibly, aggression. Care is also taken to identify the personality strengths that have been related to the possession of androgynous views of the roles for each gender, such as self-esteem, motivation, and creativity.

Based on the review of pertinent literature, it was hypothesized that: 1. Cross gender behavior would be seen as more acceptable for girls than boys 2. That this effect is more prominent in fathers than in mothers 3. That parental acceptance of cross gender behavior decreases as a child gets older.

Method

Subjects

The participants for this research were 172 parents, 121 mothers and 51 fathers, of children in an elementary school in eastern Tennessee. Forty-seven percent of the respondents answered as parents of boys, and 53%, the parents of girls. The number of parents who had children of both genders is unknown. It is not known whether any of the respondents were married couples. Parent ages ranged from 18 to 67, with a mean of 37.31 years, and the child ages ranged from 5 to 13, with a mean of 8.31 years. The parents were asked to complete a parent gender-role attitude scale and a gender appropriate toy list, and then return it to the school, thus participation was on a completely voluntary basis. Participants were not required to submit any identifying demographic information, and as such their confidentiality is guaranteed. The research protocol was approved by the university Institutional Review Board with which the authors were affiliated. There was no evident risk for participants and they were not compensated for their participation.

Instrumentation

Two surveys designed by this researcher were used in this research. The first survey, described here, was an assessment of Parental Attitudes Toward Cross Gender Behavior (PATCGB). It was constructed using items taken and modified from previous gender-role scales, including Bem's (1974) Measure of Androgyny, Feinman's (1974)

Measure of Disapproval of Cross Gender Behavior , and Burge's (1981) Child Rearing Sex Role Attitude Scale . Information concerning the validity and reliability of these tests was obtained from the Tests and Measurements in Child Development: Handbook II (Johnson, 1976). Several items were taken exactly from the Child Rearing Sex Role Attitude Scale (Burge, 1981), and others were reworded to adjust the direction of responses. Items from Bem's and Feinman's scales were used to obtain ideas for additional survey statements. The completed survey contained 40 statements: 15 statements regarding girls, 15 statements regarding boys, and 10 neutral statements. Participants were asked to rate each statement using a 7-point Likert scale. The reply of strongly agree correlated with a score of one for that item, while strongly disagree correlated with a score of seven for that item, except for item number 32, which this researcher unintentionally worded backwards, and therefore, scored backwards. Items were worded so that a high score would indicate an egalitarian viewpoint, identified by responses promoting gender equality, and a low score would indicate a traditional viewpoint, identified by responses that promoted gender inequality and gender restricted behavior. Possible scores for this survey ranged from 40, indicating an extremely traditional, or gender viewpoint, to 280, indicating an extremely egalitarian viewpoint. Items were also arranged so that an even number of male, female, and neutral statements were in odd and even positions. Split half reliability was calculated for the odd and even items. Upon analysis, a strong odd-even split half correlation with the Spearman Brown correction of .89 was obtained, similar to reliability coefficients established for Feinman's Measure of Disapproval of Cross-Sex Behavior (r= .73) and Burge's Child-Rearing Sex Role Attitude Scale (for pilot test, r =.83, for adult sample r =.92). Construct validity is made evident by the vast amount of literature dedicated to the study of this area that suggests that differing attitudes toward gender appropriate behavior do indeed exist as a construct (Antill, 1987; Bem, 1974; Feinman, 1981; Martin, 1995). Face validity is achieved in that the items do appear to be a test of what is being measured. Content validity is probable because the items are either identical or similar to items in other scales that are used to measure parent attitudes.

For this survey, a variety of scores was calculated. In addition to the odd and even scores obtained to determine reliability, scores were also calculated on the boy items,

girl items, neutral items, and of course, a total score. These scores were calculated to determine if there were any differences, or other relationships, in parents' attitudes toward cross gender behavior for sons and daughters.

Procedure

Two survey packets (one for each parent or guardian) were distributed to each of 446 students in grades K-6 at an elementary school in eastern Tennessee. Teachers passed out the surveys to each student and gave them instructions to take them home to either parents or other guardians. Students were urged to encourage both parents to complete the surveys in hopes of obtaining relatively equal numbers of male and female respondents. A cover letter was attached explaining what information was requested, the lack of risks or benefits involved in completing the survey, and a guarantee of anonymity. Parents were asked to return the completed surveys to the school within a one week time period, where they were collected by teachers and given to the school office. Out of 892 surveys distributed, 172 surveys with complete information were returned. Seven additional surveys were returned and discarded due to the absence of pertinent information.

Results

The three hypotheses investigated were (1) that cross gender behavior would be seen as more acceptable for girls than boys; (2) this effect is more prominent in fathers than in mothers; and (3) that parental acceptance of cross gender behavior decreases as a child gets older. In order to test the first hypothesis we must show that the boy score is lower on the PATCGB, meaning that more restrictive views are held for boys. The second hypothesis would require that fathers have significantly lower scores than mothers on the PATCGB. An inverse relationship between PATCGB and child age would support the third hypothesis.

Analysis of the first hypothesis that cross gender behavior is seen as more acceptable for girls than for boys produced the following results. The range of total scores for the gender-role attitude scale was 117 to 247, with a mean of 177.08 (the lower the score the more traditional the view). There was a possible range of 15 to 105 for each gender section of the survey. This sample produced a range of scores from 42 to 97, with a mean score of 67.14, for the boy score, and a range of 49 to 99, with an

average of 73.69, for the female score. A paired t – test produced a significant result (t = -10.1938, p < .0001). See Table 1.

To test hypothesis two, that this effect is more prominent in fathers than in mothers, a multivariate analysis of variance was performed on the PATCGB, with parent gender as the independent variable, and the total score, boy score, girl score, and neutral score as the dependent variables. For the PATCGB, Levene's test of equality of error variances resulted in no significant differences (F = .250, p = 0.617). With the use of Wilks' criterion, the combined dependent variables were significantly related to parent gender (F = 12.453, p < .000). See Table 2. Further analysis included Descriptive Discriminant Analysis as recommended by Huberty (1989) to allow for a multivariate interpretation. Homogeneity of variance for the discriminant function was evaluated by the Box's M test and revealed no significant differences (F = .006, p < .939). This analysis also revealed significant differences. It was apparent that the Boy Score (holding less egalitarian views for boys) contributed most to the difference among the scores of mothers and fathers on the PATCGB (See Table 2).

Finally, the effect of child age on the scores for the PATCGB was analyzed using multiple regression analysis. The predictor variables were the boy score, girl score, and neutral score from the PATCGB and the dependent variable was age of the child. No significant relationship was found between the combined predictor variables and the age of the child (F = 1.433, p < .235). Analysis of each predictor variable individually and the age of the child also produced insignificant results. See Table 4.

Discussion

Several hypotheses were put forth at the beginning of this research project. Concerning the hypothesis that parents would be more accepting of cross gender play in girls than in boys, significant results were found in all analyses, supporting this hypothesis. In agreement with the majority of research in this area, this sample of parents also possessed more traditional attitudes concerning gender appropriate behavior for boys than they did for girls. Some noteworthy findings emerged while scoring these surveys. Regardless of whether a parents' score indicated an egalitarian viewpoint or not, the majority of parents did not believe that it is healthy for a boy to cry. Out of the 172 scored surveys, 82% responded that they do not think that it is healthy

for a boy to cry when they are upset, 3% were undecided, and only 15% felt that boys should cry when upset. Another statement that yielded an interesting response referred to whether boys should physically defend themselves from school bullies. In response to this query, 50% of parents agreed that boys should fight, 14% were undecided, and 36% were opposed to boys fighting. Without further item analysis, the significance of these responses cannot be adequately determined, but it does provide evidence that regardless of a parent's level of egalitarianism, many traditional attitudes concerning appropriate behavior for boys are widely accepted.

The hypothesis that fathers would exhibit more traditional viewpoints regarding gender-roles was supported by the analysis of all scores (total, boy, girl, neutral) on the PATCGB with the boy score providing the biggest difference between mothers' and fathers' scores. Fathers, and males in general, tend to hold more traditional viewpoints when it comes to equity among genders (Fagot & Leinbach, 1995; Lindsey et al., 1997). Perhaps this is because only the female gender role has been allowed to expand its limits over the past few decades, and males have been subjected to the same rigid boy code that has been in effect for centuries (Garner et al., 1997; Glazer, 1999; Ko, 1999; Stapley et al., 1989; Zeman & Shipman, 1996).

The final hypothesis was that parents would exert a more traditional set of values on older pre-teen children than they would on younger, primary aged children. This hypothesis was not supported by the results. The results of this analysis indicated that parents tend to hold on to their same egalitarian or traditional views regardless of the child's age. However, a longitudinal study as opposed to this cross-sectional survey, might produce different results.

One limitation of this study has to do with the male response rate. Approximately three times as many mothers as fathers completed and returned the surveys. A larger sample of male respondents could have altered the findings. A second limitation concerns the number of responses received. Although 172 surveys constitute a rather large sample, this was only a 20% response rate. It is possible that the parents who did not return the surveys had viewpoints that were significantly different from those who did return the surveys. The third limitation of this study is the use of new, unpiloted questionnaires for the assessment of the parents. Although both instruments yielded

high split-half correlation, further correlation with established scales and re-testing with these same scales would greatly strengthen the reliability and validity of these instruments. Another weakness in this study was the use of convenience sampling. All parents were parents of children at the same school, living in the same geographic area. Which brings us to the last limitation that could have an effect on this study, the area of the country from which this sample was recruited. This study was conducted in a small rural community in the South, where traditional values have been shown to be stronger and more rigid than in other areas of the country, especially traditional values regarding the roles of men and women (Ellison & Musick, 1993). Although this research has been fairly consistent with results from past investigations (Burge, 1981; Campagnola, 1995; Fagot & Leinbach, 1989; Fivush et al.), generalizability is limited.

Even prior to this study, the differences between mothers' and fathers' views on gender equity have been very well established (Antill, 1987; Campagnola, 1995; Fagot & Leinbach, 1989; Fivush et al., 2000), as have the differences in the extent to which we accept cross gender behavior in boys and girls (Antill, 1987; Burn et al, 1996, Feinman, 1981; Sandnabba & Ahlberg, 1999). The benefits of androgynous attitudes in children and adults have also been well documented (Burn et al., 1966; Garren, 1998; Moringa et al., 1993; Witt, 1997), as well as the detrimental effects of rigidly traditional attitudes (Glazer, 1999; Ko, 1999; Moringa et al., 1993; Pollack, 1999; Silverstein et al., 1997; Zeman & Shipman, 1996). Future research into the development of gender equity programs for children and gender equity education for parents would be instrumental in advancing the social evolution of mankind

For the largest part, this research has complemented already existent literature on the effects of parent gender on gender-role attitudes. This research also looked at variables that are not very well documented including changes in parental gender-role attitudes as their children grow older. This variables yielded insignificant results, but limitations of this study suggest that perhaps these variables should be examined in future research efforts.

References

Antill, J. K. (1987). Parents' beliefs and values about sex roles, sex differences, and sexuality. In P. Shaver & C. Hendrick (Eds.), Sex and gender: Vol. 4. Review of personality and social psychology. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Bailey, J. M., Dunne, M. P., & Martin, N. G. (2000). Genetic and environmental influences on sexual orientation and its correlates in an Australian twin sample. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78, 524-527.

Bell, A. P., Weinberg, M. S., & Hammersmith, S. K. (1981). Sexual Preference: Its Development in Men and Women. Bloomfield: Indiana University Press.

Bern, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.

Burge, P. L. (1981). Parental child-rearing sex role attitudes related to social issue sex role attitudes and selected demographic variables. Home Economics Research Journal, 9, 193-199.

Burn, S. M., O'Neil, A. K., & Nederend, S. (1996). Childhood tomboyism and adult androgyny. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 34, 419-428.

Campagnola, G. A. (1995). Sex-differentiated parent-child interactions in a sample with one-year-old opposite-sex twins. Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences, 55, 1825.

Dworetzky, J. P. (1997). Psychology. (6th Ed.) Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Ellison, C. G. and Musick, M. A. (1993). Southern intolerance: A fundamentalist effect? Social Forces, 72, 379-399.

Fagot, B. I. & Leinbach, M. D. (1989). The young child's gender schema: Environmental Input, internal organizations. Child Development, 60, 663-672.

Fagot, B. I. & Leinbach, M. D. (1995). Gender knowledge in egalitarian and traditional families. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 32, 513-514.

Feinman. S. (1981). Why is cross-sex-role behavior more approved for girls than for boys? A status characteristic approach. Sex Roles, 7, 289-299.

Fivush, R., Brotman, M. A., Buckner, J. P., & Goodman, S. H. (2000). Gender differences in parent-child emotion narratives. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, Feb., 233.

Garner, P. W., Robertson, s., & Smith, G. (1997). Preschool children's emotional expressions with peers: the roles of gender and emotion socialization. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 36, 675-692.

Garren, B. A. (1998). The influence of parental attitudes toward childrearing and creativity in relation to children's creative functioning. Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences, 58, 4180.

Geschwind, N. & Behan, P. (1982). Left-handedness: Association with immune disease, migraine, and developmental learning disorder. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America-Biological Sciences, 79, 5097-5100.

Glazer, S. (1999). Boys' emotional needs. CQ Researcher, 9, 521.

Huberty, C. J. & Barton, R. M. (1989). An introduction to discriminant analysis. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 2 , 158-168.

Johnson, O. G. Tests and Measurements in Child development: Handbook II. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Ko, M. (1999). The masculinity muddle. Alberta Report, 26, 41.

MacNaughton, G. (1997). A strategic approach to collaborating with parents for gender equity in early childhood. Australian Journal of early Childhood, 22, 23-29.

Martin, C. L. (1995). Stereotypes about children with traditional and nontraditional gender roles. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 33, 727-752.

Morinaga, Y., Frieze, I. H., & Ferligoj, A. (1993). Career plans and gender-role attitudes of college students in the United States, Japan, and Slovenia. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 29, 317-318.

Paul, J. P. (1993). Childhood cross gender behavior and adult homosexuality: the resurgence of biological models of sexuality. Journal of Homosexuality, 24, 41-55.

Pollack, W. (1999). Real boys, gender roles of boys and violence. NEA Today, 18, 21-25.

Rothbart, M. K. & Maccoby, E. E. (1966). Parents' differential reactions to sons and daughters. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 237-243.

Sandnabba, N. K. & Ahlberg, C. (1999). Parents' attitudes and expectations about children's cross-gender behavior. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 40, 249-250.

Silverstein, B. & Blumenthal, E. (1997). Depression mixed with anxiety, somatization, and disordered eating: Relationship with gender-role-related limitations experienced by females. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 36, 709-725.

Stapley, J. C. & Haviland, J. M. (1989). Beyond depression: gender differences in normal adolescents' emotional experiences. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 20, 295-309.

Witt. S. D. (1997). Parental influence on children's socialization to gender roles. Adolescence, 32, 252-259.

Zeman, J. & Shipman, K. (1996). Children's expression of negative affect: reasons and methods. Developmental Psychology, 32, 842-850.

Table 1

Analysis for Hypothesis 1

T-Test

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	BOYS CORE - GIRLS CO	-6.8256	8.81478	.6721	-8.1523	-5.4989	-10.155	171	.000

Table 2

Analysis for Hypothesis 2

Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.984	3529.153	3.000	168.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.016	3529.153	3.000	168.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	63.021	3529.153	3.000	168.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	63.021	3529.153	3.000	168.000	.000
PGENDER	Pillai's Trace	.182	12.453	3.000	168.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.818	12.453	3.000	168.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	.222	12.453	3.000	168.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	.222	12.453	3.000	168.000	.000

a Exact statistic
b Design: Intercept+PGENDER

Structure Matrix For Canonical Discriminant Function Analysis of PATCGB

Structure Matrix

	Function 1
BOYSCORE	.990
TOTALSCO	.825
NEUTRALS	.516
GIRLSCO	.515

Pooled within-groups correlations between discriminating variables and standardized canonical discriminant functions Variables ordered by absolute size of correlation within function.
a This variable not used in the analysis.

Table 3

Analysis for Hypothesis 3

Regression

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	22.891	3	7.630	1.433	.235
	Residual	894.574	168	5.325		
	Total	917.465	171			

a Predictors: (Constant), NEUTRALS, BOYSCORE, GIRLSCO
b Dependent Variable: AGEOFCHI

Coefficients

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	9.894	1.460		6.776	.000
	BOYSCORE	2.147E-02	.024	.089	.898	.370
	GIRLSCO	-8.376E-03	.023	-.037	-.364	.717
	NEUTRALS	-6.736E-02	.038	-.165	-1.779	.077

a Dependent Variable: AGEOFCHI

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Parental Attitudes Toward Cross Gender Behavior	
Author(s): Robin L. Leonard & Andrea D. Clements	
Corporate Source: East Tennessee State University	Publication Date: Nov. 8, 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑ ☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Robin L. Leonard	Printed Name/Position/Title: Robin L. Leonard / Student
Organization/Address: East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN 37614	Telephone: 423-538-5025 / FAX:
	E-Mail Address: Robin1210@AOL / Date: 11-8-02

PS031066

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)